



## Town of Ashland, *Office of Conservation*

MEETING MINUTES  
ASHLAND CONSERVATION COMMISSION  
January 20, 2026

Present: Gregory Wands (Chair)  
Carl Hakansson (Vice Chair)  
Owen Ackerman  
Preston Crow  
Gene Crouch  
William Moulton (Attended remotely)

Agent: Becca Solomon  
Assistant: Sofia Chrisafideis

Meeting held in person in the Select Board Room and remotely via zoom  
Call to order: 7:05 P.M.

**Chair Gregory Wands read the Ashland Conservation Commission virtual meeting protocols, and meeting recording announcement. Mr. Wands announced that the Conservation Commission was implementing a three-minute limit for each resident comment per hearing.**

**Notice of Intent, 61 Waverly Street, Map 15 Parcel 12, The Gutierrez Company, DEP File No. Not Yet Issued**

Mr. Wands summarized that the Commission will be discussing a portion of the response to GCG's (Commission's stormwater peer reviewer) peer review comments. Mr. Lopez (Project Applicant – Gutierrez Company) summarized that they plan to present their response to GCG's peer review, that the presentation has been grouped in accordance with the outline provided by Mr. Wands, and that discussion will focus on drainage, the culvert in Waverly Street, and comments in response to Beals and Thomas' (Commission's peer reviewer) wetland review. Mr. Hakansson asked why a formal response to comments was not submitted to the Commission at this time. Mr. Lopez responded that they do plan to submit a full response and will be providing that full memo in the next few days with an updated plan set as well.

Mr. Norton (Geologist with Sanborn Head for the Applicant) summarized that that he is under the impression that there are many questions regarding the subsurface reevaluation of the site. Mr. Norton continued, that fault lines are indicators of previous geological activity and that bedrock on site is of the Avalon Granite lithology group, that there is a fault line to the east of the site where the lithology type changes from granite to mafic bedrock, and another minor fault line within the Avalon Granite geologic unit directly adjacent to East Union Street, also off-site. Mr. Norton continued, that Massachusetts is not known for seismic activity, however, there is still evidence of movement of fault lines, and could have been active

42 between 200 million and 500 million years ago. Mr. Norton added that localized features are observed on  
43 site, where there are ridges of bedrock present on site, and that ridge line is buried beneath the surface on  
44 the property and is typically higher in elevation, and some of that ledge is visible from the street level.  
45 Mr. Norton explained that this ridgeline runs northwest to southeast on the site. Mr. Norton continued, that  
46 there is glacial evidence on site as boulders, and they have investigated some of the larger boulders to  
47 determine whether they are bedrock outcroppings or if they are a surface boulder feature. Mr. Norton  
48 explained that, a boulder was discussed in the comment letter as TP-106 and was evaluated in the field and  
49 determined to be a surface boulder and not bedrock. Mr. Norton explained that while they do anticipate  
50 encountering some bedrock during construction, it is not expected to interact with the stormwater systems  
51 as proposed. Mr. Norton added that cross-sections were included in the response packet, showing areas  
52 where bedrock dips away from the ridgeline on the site. Mr. Norton added that blasting is a highly-regulated  
53 procedure, there is intense monitoring of the blasting sequence, and would have to comply with a host of  
54 state regulations in order for bedrock blasting to take place.

55  
56 Mr. Hakansson explained that the Commission wants to make it clear that during the construction of a  
57 nearby building at 16 Union Street, there was an incredible amount of groundwater that percolated up from  
58 bedrock and ledge as a direct result of blasting. Mr. Norton explained that they did not encounter  
59 groundwater during the subsurface evaluation for a majority of the site, and no groundwater was observed  
60 at the ridge. Mr. Norton added that there is also no evidence of significant water-bearing fractures along  
61 Waverly Street at the exposed rock surface, and that the data on site shows that the rock is not water-  
62 bearing. Mr. Norton continued, that they would expect having to deal with low spots in the rock during  
63 construction and dewatering would be of larger concern, not water in bedrock. Mr. Norton added that the  
64 grade changes radially on site, where there is a high point in the middle of the site, and gradually reduces in  
65 elevation to the borders of the site.

66  
67 Mr. Crouch asked how bedrock level was determined for the cross-sections. Mr. Norton responded that rock  
68 elevation was determined based on data collected from soil test pits and depth to bedrock, and was  
69 projected over the site to interpolate an approximate elevation of bedrock across the site. Mr. Crouch asked  
70 if additional probing was completed, or if only test pits were done. Mr. Norton responded that test pits are  
71 the general practice. Mr. Crouch asked if the condition of the bedrock was observed. Mr. Norton responded  
72 that there is a limited amount of characterization of bedrock they can get, but they were able to observe  
73 rippability (indication of weathering or fracturing), and were able to determine that the rock was reasonably  
74 stable. Mr. Hakansson asked that, if a granite vein runs where the Public Safety Building is, through the High  
75 School, and up to an old granite quarry; all three of which had water contained within fractures of the  
76 bedrock, how they were able to determine that this rock does not have water in it. Mr. Norton responded  
77 that the rock lacks obvious fracturing, water-bearing fractures, and is in higher elevation than other nearby  
78 sites. Mr. Crouch added that contractors at those nearby sites were unable to control the large volumes of  
79 water coming out of the ledge at those sites. Mr. Norton reiterated that they will only be doing trenches  
80 within bedrock for select utility connections, and do not expect to release water from the ledge.

81  
82 Mr. Mouton asked if only test pits were completed or if borings were done to supplement the data.  
83 Mr. Norton responded that only test pits were completed. Mr. Moulton asked where rock will be removed  
84 from the site. Mr. Norton clarified that they only plan to remove soil for the construction of the buildings,  
85 and should only have to remove a little ledge for the installation of utility lines and possibly remove some  
86 bedrock for a few footings for the building foundation. Mr. Park (Project Engineer for SMMA) explained that  
87 the site was designed in a way to avoid removing as much bedrock as possible, and most of the bedrock  
88 removal occurs in the parking lot on the East Union Street side where there will be minor ledge removal for  
89 utility and drainage installation, and they do anticipate that one of the garage foundations may also require

90 the removal of bedrock, and are confident that the site design avoids bedrock as much as possible.  
91 Mr. Wands asked if the principal structure will be located in a bedrock depression. Mr. Norton responded  
92 that the building will be located where the ridgeline dips away from the soil surface, and added that enough  
93 bedrock will be removed to create a soil cushion for the foundations to be supported on.

94  
95 Mr. Carter (GCG Associates) asked how many test pits were completed. Mr. Norton responded that 20 test  
96 pits were completed. Mr. Carter explained that the Commission has brought up a good point, and explained  
97 that there must be a solid understanding of how the subsurface evaluation was completed, and suggested  
98 that a topographic plan be submitted showing the bedrock elevations across the site. Mr. Carter explained  
99 that there is a drain line running parallel to Waverly Street, and that because of the potential for blasting the  
100 trench for that utility connection, they need to be sure that water will not flow out from the ledge, and  
101 suggested doing additional cross sectional bedrock profiles at Waverly Street to investigate the bedrock  
102 further at the proposed driveway cut. Mr. Norton responded that they do have two cross-sectional profiles  
103 of bedrock going across the site at critical portions of the stormwater design. Mr. Carter asked that they do  
104 not anticipate fracturing of ledge when blasting. Mr. Norton confirmed. Mr. Carter asked how far into the  
105 bedrock will blasting material be placed. Mr. Norton responded that it varies on the rock type, however,  
106 they typically drill the bore hole for the blasting product a couple feet below the proposed invert. Mr. Carter  
107 responded that if a low-point in the ledge exists, it could collect water and could potentially be impacted  
108 during blasting procedures, causing that water to uncontrollably flow on site, causing issues similar to those  
109 described during construction of the Public Safety Building, which is why a topographic map of the bedrock  
110 surface is important, and could serve to identify any low points of bedrock on site. Mr. Crouch clarified that  
111 water percolating into the soil will flow down across the surface of bedrock and into the utility trenches, and  
112 could daylight somewhere else on site. Mr. Carter confirmed. Mr. Crouch asked if clay barriers within the  
113 trench would help. Mr. Carter agreed. Mr. Park responded that bentonite breakers within utility trenches  
114 could be included into the plan and site sequencing. Mr. Crouch explained that there is a lot of water coming  
115 down from that ledge and there has been a historic icing issue along that stretch of road at Waverly Street.  
116 Mr. Norton responded that they did investigate that slope, and they observed that melting at the surface of  
117 the site is a variable of the season, and not water within the rock itself. Mr. Park responded that he  
118 observed that area last week during a time of significant snow melt, and that area of Waverly Street was  
119 bone-dry and there was water trickling down from the bedrock. Mr. Crouch responded that there is a  
120 drought at this time. Mr. Hakansson added that not much snow was on the ground to melt.

121  
122 Mr. Park added that he did observe that ledge recently, and did not notice any sign of water flow or icing,  
123 and that once the site is constructed and stabilized, that the amount of water that runs down from that  
124 ledge will be significantly decreased. Mr. Park continued, that they will be installing an impermeable liner-  
125 curtain on the downslope portion of bedrock adjacent to Waverly Street, and while they do not expect there  
126 to be breakout along the retaining wall on Waverly Street, any water that might horizontally-migrate from  
127 the subsurface infiltration system would not migrate towards the ledge on the Waverly Street side.  
128 Mr. Crouch stated that Massachusetts is currently in a significant drought, and so an isolated observation of  
129 the lack of water or icing in this area is insignificant.

130  
131 Mr. Small (Ashland Department of Public Works (DPW) Director) explained that Mr. Langmeyer (Stormwater  
132 and Highway Technician) from the DPW has more experience handling the icing issue on Waverly Street, and  
133 Ms. Walker (resident) also has some information on that, however, he is not prepared to speak to this issue  
134 tonight.

135  
136 Ms. Walker (Member of the Stormwater Advisory Committee, speaking as a resident, 123 Waverly Street)  
137 explained that she has lived in Town for 60 years and noted that the water that comes out of the ledge at all

138 different levels; sometimes at the bottom of the rock and sometimes in the middle or top, and certainly  
139 does create hazardous conditions.

140  
141 Mr. Park added that what he observed last week was a limited observation, however, he and the rest of the  
142 team is confident that their proposal should mitigate this icing issue by infiltrating surface runoff into large  
143 subsurface infiltration systems. Mr. Park agreed, and added that this will be incorporated into their next  
144 response package.

145  
146 Mr. Crow added that there has been pushback from residents regarding blasting on site, and suggested  
147 finding other techniques other than blasting.

148  
149 Mr. Johnson, 4 Roberts Road, asked that if blasting does take place, that abutters are notified appropriately.

150  
151 Mr. Lopez added that The Gutierrez Company and Sanborn Head has lots of experience developing sites that  
152 contain ledge, and that they fully understand the blasting process and the pre-blast survey, and that  
153 residences within a 250-ft radius must be notified, and that the ZBA's comprehensive permit contains  
154 significant rules, regulations, and provisions regarding the blasting process on site. Mr. Hakansson asked  
155 that Mr. Lopez understands their hesitation with the nearby sites. Mr. Lopez agreed, and explained that  
156 their proposal is a completely different excavation program. Mr. Small added that it is important that the  
157 Waverly Street culvert be included in the blasting survey.

158  
159 Mr. Park explained that it was recommended that they discuss hydrology of the site, and continued that  
160 many comments from GCG were made regarding hydrology, that the hydrologic soil group be revised from  
161 "woods/grass in good condition" to "woods in good condition", which was completed, and that the design  
162 points (DPs) were divided further from 3 DPs to 5. Mr. Park explained the location of each design point.  
163 Mr. Park continued, that the Massachusetts Stormwater Standard #2 require that the 2- and 10- year storms  
164 result in no change in the rate of existing and proposed stormwater runoff, and that their proposal meets  
165 this requirement. Mr. Park continued, that there are no increases in runoff during the 2-year storm for all  
166 DPs, there is a small increase in the 10-year storm at DP-4 and DP-5, and several small increases during the  
167 100-year storm. Mr. Park added that minor increases are the result of small strips of land around the  
168 perimeter on site, such as the backside of the surface detention basin, a wooded area at the tip of the site  
169 that they chose to not develop, and that HydroCAD was not designed for a drainage area for a few hundred  
170 feet, but entire watersheds, and so the numbers provided may be inflated and should not reflect actual site  
171 conditions post-development. Mr. Park continued, that for runoff to be captured on these small strips, they  
172 would have to clear nearly 100% of the property west of the wetland area. Mr. Park added that the  
173 bioretention area was swapped out for a Stormtech™ subsurface detention system to collect water from the  
174 driveway, and cannot collect runoff coming down from the lowest portions of the driveway due to site  
175 elevations and to avoid additional bedrock removal. Mr. Park reiterated that in order to reduce post-  
176 development runoff conditions, they would have to implement an irresponsible and unreasonable drainage  
177 system around the perimeter of the site, stretching drain lines from the proposed driveway to the tip of the  
178 site at the East Union Street and Waverly Street intersection, and similarly from the midpoint of the  
179 property line along East Union Street to the tip of the site. Mr. Hakansson clarified that only State law is  
180 being applied to this proposal, and that there are state performance standards that govern Stormwater, and  
181 that the proposal is currently attempting to meet those state standards. Mr. Hakansson asked Mr. Park to  
182 elaborate on that, and asked Mr. Carter to weigh in on the numbers presented. Mr. Park responded that he  
183 does not have any additional commentary and would also like to hear from Mr. Carter. Mr. Hakansson asked  
184 that the standards are being met except for 2 points, and that in order to fully meet the standards, the  
185 project would be unsightly. Mr. Park agreed, and added that the State governs 10 Stormwater Management

186 Standards, and that the project is in compliance with those Standards. Mr. Carter stated that GCG has not  
187 reviewed any revised plans. Mr. Carter continued, that if there is a 0.05 CFS increase in one DP, to clear that  
188 portion of the site to capture that runoff is not in the best interest of the Project, the Town, or residents,  
189 and that the post-development peak discharge values for the 100-year storm are not significantly large  
190 values. Mr. Carter added that once other aspects of the site design are addressed and an agreement is  
191 reached on the status of the culvert and drainage system in Waverly Street, the proposal should comply  
192 with the Standards. Mr. Carter agreed that the models are not exact, and it would not be worth clearing the  
193 site further. Mr. Hakansson asked if there is a middle ground. Mr. Carter responded that once they review a  
194 revised plan set, he will be able to make that decision, however, he cannot say at this time. Mr. Crouch  
195 asked if a revised plan set has been received. Mr. Park responded that a formal revised plan set was not  
196 submitted. Mr. Crouch stated that there must be 2-ft of separation between the bottom elevation of the  
197 detention system the seasonal high ground water, and that if there is not 2-ft of separation, the system  
198 cannot qualify for the infiltration Standard requirement. Mr. Park responded that the original design did  
199 provide 4-ft of separation to avoid a groundwater mounding analysis, and that the system was changed to a  
200 detention system to limit the amount of water leaving the site to meet the peak discharge rate  
201 requirements. Mr. Crouch asked if all infiltration systems are located 50-ft from the wetland edge. Mr. Park  
202 confirmed. Mr. Crouch stated that, for DP-4 and 5, flow is considerably reduced in the 100-year storm but  
203 increased for 10-year storms in the proposed conditions, and asked how that could happen. Mr. Park  
204 responded that he can provide an answer to that question at the next hearing. Mr. Crouch added that what  
205 the Commission will need is a detailed discussion as to why the proposed peak discharge rates are not an  
206 issue for exceeding the Standard, as MassDEP has also raised that question in their review of the proposal.  
207 Mr. Park agreed, and added that the design points that drain to a BVW and jurisdictional areas do not have  
208 an increase in peak discharge rates for the 2- and 10-year storms. Ms. Solomon added that at the  
209 intersection of East Union Street and Waverly Street, there is another culvert that drains into the Sudbury  
210 River a jurisdictional area.

211  
212 Mr. Ring, (Open Space and Recreation Committee Member, speaking as a resident, 42 Bay Colony Drive),  
213 summarized that Mr. Park mentioned that hydrologic models being used typically model larger systems, and  
214 asked if Mr. Park could specify the accuracy of the models being used. Mr. Park responded that the precision  
215 of the models is being reviewed. Mr. Hakansson clarified that the runoff numbers provided by the model  
216 were brought to the Commission's attention by MassDEP, and the Commission would be derelict to not  
217 question it. Mr. Crouch reiterated that the Standard specifies that there be no increase in post-development  
218 peak discharge rates, and that the Commission must enforce that standard.

219  
220 Mr. Park explained that at the Commission's request, the existing conditions view frame has been expanded  
221 to show the neighboring property which contains a perimeter drainage swale, directing water from the  
222 BVW, and underneath Waverly Street through an existing culvert, as well as showing the two existing catch  
223 basins which are connected by an existing 12-in RCP and plumbed into that culvert. Mr. Park added that the  
224 runoff calculations show no increase in the 2- and 10-year storms to this system. Mr. Park summarized that  
225 the Commission questioned the structural integrity and capacity of the culvert, and that SMMA and The  
226 Gutierrez Company are not disputing the age or state of supporting elements of the culvert. Mr. Park  
227 continued that at the time of their investigation, the culvert was bone-dry, there were no signs of gully or  
228 erosion at the bottom of the culvert, and that the proposal will not be changing these conditions on its own.  
229 Mr. Park further explained that there are multiple other systems and offsite properties that contribute to  
230 that culvert independent of the proposal at 61 Waverly Street. Mr. Park continued that, regarding the  
231 capacity of the 12" RCP, and with conservative estimates, the existing pipe has a capacity of 2.5 CFS with a  
232 slope of 0.5%, and that their calculations show a 1.35 CFS contribution in a 100-year storm. Mr. Park added  
233 that the culvert is functioning as intended and that the proposal should not change the condition of that

234 pipe. Mr. Park added that it was his opinion that the pipe going into the culvert are in much better condition  
235 than what photos provided by the DPW insinuate, and suggested that shadows cast from a flashlight or  
236 phone camera flash can exaggerate the pipe joints to make them appear much more disjointed than reality.  
237 Mr. Lopez summarized that their project is not contributing flow through the culvert or the RCP, and that  
238 the comment provided by MassDEP is misleading in that, the WPA standard is not regarding and absolute  
239 increase, but asks that there is no impact to downstream wetlands resource areas. Mr. Lopez reiterated that  
240 the proposal is not overburdening those existing structures, and that it is their understanding that the  
241 current proposal does not impact downstream resource areas.

242  
243 Mr. Hakansson explained that there is significant scouring that leaves the culvert, and to explain that the  
244 culvert is bone-dry and should remain as such is inaccurate. Mr. Hakansson stated that the peer review  
245 requested closer CCTV inspection of the drain lines, and asked if the Applicant would agree to completing  
246 such. Mr. Lopez responded that they would consider going further than an investigation of the drain line,  
247 and would consider a Condition with in the Order of Conditions that gave them the ability to replace that  
248 pipe (the drain line connecting each of the two catch basins in Waverly Street) to improve the resilience of  
249 the system at that location. Mr. Hakansson clarified that what is being referred to as a drainage swale might  
250 be an intermittent stream, and asked if that was taken into account in their runoff models. Mr. Lopez  
251 confirmed. Mr. Hakansson asked for confirmation that The Gutierrez Company would agree to replace that  
252 drain line as a part of their proposal. Mr. Lopez confirmed. Mr. Crouch asked that it is shown on the map  
253 that DP-1 is the CB that is plumbed into the culvert, and that DP-2 is the BVW in the rear, also reviewing flow  
254 from the site, which flows into the swale/intermittent stream and joins into the culvert. Mr. Crouch asked  
255 what sub-watersheds are contributing to that culvert. Mr. Park responded that, as with all proposals, DPs  
256 terminate at the property line, and for this site, they have opted to use the NDZ as an alternate termination  
257 point, and does not disagree that these DPs do intermingle. Mr. Park added that they were asked to refine  
258 the DPs from 3 areas to 5 by GCG. Mr. Crouch explained that, as several DPs are draining to the culvert, the  
259 culvert is technically a super DP, and asked which sub watersheds are contributing to the culvert. Mr. Park  
260 responded that that was not really looked into, and would require re-analyzing the site. The Commission  
261 further discussed the drainage calculations in detail, and that if DP-1 and DP-2 were to be combined, peak  
262 discharge rate summaries may be reduced. Mr. Carter asked for confirmation that a 12-in RCP leads into the  
263 inlet the box culvert, which would restrict the capacity of the stone box culvert. Mr. Park confirmed.  
264 Mr. Hakansson explained that the bottom line is, they are taking an undeveloped, wooded parcel and  
265 introducing an area of impervious, developed land cover, and so there is reasonable skepticism from the  
266 Commission and residents alike in confirming that there will not be excess runoff leaving the site.  
267 Mr. Hakansson added that page 3 in the peer review was not addressed in the memorandum, and asked  
268 that replacing the pipe would be discussed in the next response letter provided by SMMA. Mr. Lopez agreed,  
269 and added that in the Comprehensive Permit, there was a condition that all plans are submitted to the DPW  
270 for their review and approval. Mr. Crouch added that replacing the pipe would also require a Road Opening  
271 Permit. Mr. Hakansson asked if Mr. Lopez would be amenable to allowing Mr. Carter to attend a third  
272 hearing, as it was not included in the contract. Mr. Lopez agreed.

273  
274 Ms. Solomon summarized that the preview provided by Beals and Thomas did suggest a few alterations to  
275 the wetland boundary. Mr. Arnold (Goddard Consulting – wetland specialist for the Project) explained that  
276 information was submitted to Beals and Thomas for review along with a supplemental wetland delineation  
277 report, and have not heard any additional comments from Beals and Thomas or the Commission regarding  
278 that information. Mr. Arnold continued that Beals and Thomas recommended 2 flagging changes; 1 change  
279 from S4 and S5 to better define the bank line based on the existing topography, and another at A46, and the  
280 plans will be updated to reflect those changes and the site design will remain outside of the 25-ft No Disturb  
281 Zone after those changes. At GCA35, Beals and Thomas raised a question regarding hydrology, and that

282 while soils displayed hydric features, it still may not be considered a wetland soil, however, plans will be  
283 updated to reflect that change. Mr. Arnold added that regarding the swale/stream, the team is not disputing  
284 that hydrologic connection, however, the Standard is asking that and there are no adverse impacts to the  
285 wetlands on site and therefore no impact to downstream resource areas. Mr. Crouch asked that the  
286 applicant team is accepting all comment made by Beals and Thomas. Mr. Arnold confirmed. Mr. Hakansson  
287 asked if Beals and Thomas was asked to address blasting on site. Ms. Solomon responded that Beals and  
288 Thomas do plan to speak to that, and that Beals and Thomas understood that the order of operations was to  
289 address compliance in respect to wetland delineation, and then look at the compliance in regards to the  
290 wetlands protection act and the impact of blasting. Mr. Hakansson suggested that Mr. Norton be present for  
291 that discussion. Mr. Norton acknowledged that suggestion. Mr. Arnold requested that the Commission  
292 confirms the delineation as presented. Mr. Crouch responded that he would prefer to see the changes in the  
293 field, however, as they have conceded to the changes requested by Beals and Thomas, he is comfortable  
294 with accepting the delineation as presented. Mr. Arnold added that their goal of confirming the delineation  
295 is consequential to the final site design. The Commission agreed to the delineation as discussed, in response  
296 to the review provided by Beals and Thomas. Ms. Solomon suggested that the plans also be updated in  
297 regards to requirements set forth in the Zoning Board of Appeals Decision discussing erosion and  
298 sedimentation controls and site sequencing. Mr. Hakansson asked if the proposal is respecting the 25-ft No  
299 Disturb Zone. Mr. Arnold confirmed. Ms. Solomon read the language provided in the decision. Mr. Lopez  
300 requested that Beals and Thomas' final review be received in time for the applicant team to provide  
301 comments on that as well.

302  
303 Ms. Bennet (Member of the Select Board, speaking as a resident, 9 Sandstone Way) stated that it is difficult  
304 to imagine the post-development drainage conditions of the parcel.

305  
306 Mr. Ring, 42 Bay Colony Drive, continued to discuss the accuracy of the hydrology models.

307  
308 The Commission and the applicant team discussed and agreed to a date for the next hearing.

309  
310 **Motion:** Mr. Hakansson moved to continue the hearing for the Notice of Intent at 61 Waverly Street, Map  
311 15 Parcel 12 to February, 2, 2026, at 7:05 PM. The motion was seconded by Mr. Crow.

312 **Vote:** The motion passed with a 6-0-0 vote. (Rollcall vote: OA, PC, GC, CH, WM, GW)

313  
314 Ms. Solomon confirmed that the meeting has been added to the calendar.

315  
316 **Review of Open Space status, 0 Cross Street, Map 18 Parcel 82, Conservation and Open Space**  
317 **Requirements**

318 Ms. Solomon explained that as there is currently a quorum of the Open Space and Recreation Committee  
319 (OSRC), one of the members will have to recuse themselves from the discussion.

320  
321 **Mr. Wands recused himself from the discussion and left the room.**

322  
323 **Mr. Hakansson took over the meeting as Chair for the purposes of this discussion.**

324  
325 Mr. Hakansson explained that an issue has been brought before them and the status of a parcel is being  
326 contested. Mr. Hakansson asked Ms. Soolman (Chair of the OSRC) to further explain the situation.  
327 Ms. Soolman explained that there is a solar project on Frankland Road in Hopkinton, who is in ownership of  
328 the 0 Cross Street parcel in Ashland. Ms. Soolman continued, that when Agilitas accepted that property,  
329 there were special conditions enacted by the Hopkinton Conservation Commission, stating that there are

330 certain parts of the parcel that can be developed for solar use, and other portions must be converted to  
331 designated open space and be permanently protected under the two conditions of the special permit, either  
332 by being transferred to a conservation entity to hold it in perpetuity, or to place a Conservation Restriction  
333 on the property, neither of which has happened. Ms. Soolman continued, that Agilitas has a buyer lined up  
334 to purchase the (Ashland portion of the) property for development, which is blatantly against those two  
335 conditions on the special permit. The Town of Hopkinton is being asked to enforce that order, and that on  
336 behalf of the OSRC, she is asking the Conservation Commission to support the Town of Hopkinton in forcing  
337 that decision. The Chair of the Ashland Planning Board suggested that the OSRC may be of some help in  
338 forcing this decision, and passed a motion at their previous hearing to protect the full parcel, included open  
339 space in Ashland. Ms. Soolman continued, that Ashland cannot force those conditions to be obliged by,  
340 however, can support the Town of Hopkinton to enforce the decision. The Commission discussed the status  
341 of the open space parcel in Ashland.

342  
343 **Motion:** Mr. Crouch moved to support the effort to urge the Town of Hopkinton to enforce the findings and  
344 decision of the Office of the Planning Board for the Town of Hopkinton dated August 19, 2020 regarding 0  
345 Cross Street and 71 Frankland Road to protect the full parcel including open space in Hopkinton and  
346 Ashland, pursuant to special conditions 28 and 29 of the Hopkinton Planning Board permit for the site, and  
347 to urge the Town of Hopkinton and the Town of Ashland to work together to immediately enforce the  
348 findings and decision of the Office of the Planning Board for the Town of Hopkinton, made on August 19,  
349 2020. The motion was seconded by Mr. Crow.

350 **Vote:** The motion passed with a 5-0-0 vote. (Rollcall vote: OA, PC, GC, WM, CH) Mr. Wands recused.

351

352 **Mr. Wands returned to the meeting and took the meeting over as Chair.**

353

354 **Review Minutes from 1/5/2026:**

355 **1/5/2026 Meeting Minutes:**

356 The Commission reviewed and edited the January 5, 2026 meeting minutes.

357

358 **Motion:** Mr. Hakansson moved to approve the January 5, 2026 meeting minutes as discussed. The motion  
359 was seconded by Mr. Crow.

360 **Vote:** The motion passed with a 6-0-0 vote. (Rollcall vote: OA, PC, GC, CH, WM, GW)

361

362 **Member Prerogative:**

363 No discussion was made.

364

365 **Meeting Adjournment:**

366 **Motion:** Mr. Hakansson moved to adjourn the meeting. The motion was seconded by Mr. Crow.

367 **Vote:** The motion passed with a 6-0-0 vote. (Rollcall vote: OA, PC, GC, CH, WM, GW)

368

369 **The meeting was adjourned at 10:57 PM.**

370

371 **Documents Reviewed by the Commission:**

- 372 • Document entitled, Meeting Agenda, dated 1/20/2026
- 373 • Document entitled, Agent Report, dated 1/20/2026
- 374 • Document entitled, Meeting Minutes, dated 1/5/2026
- 375 • Document entitled, Beals and Thomas Wetland Review, Dated 1/15/2026
- 376 • Document entitled, Applicant's Response to GCG's Peer Review, Dated 1/13/2026

- 377 • Document entitled, MassDEP's Comment Letter Dated 1/6/2026
- 378 • Document entitled, Applicant's Response to Conservation Commission's Comments Dated
- 379 12/23/2025
- 380 • Document entitled, GCG Peer Review Dated 12/17/2025
- 381 • Document entitled, 61 Waverly Street NOI, dated 10/29/2025
- 382 • Plans entitled, 61 Waverly Street Drawings, dated 10/29/2025
- 383 • Document entitled, Signed ConCom Letter to ZBA, 61 Waverly Street, dated March 2025
- 384 • Document entitled, Town of Ashland, Mail – ConCom Letter Regarding 40B Waiver Requests 61
- 385 Waverly St, dated 10/23/2025
- 386 • Document entitled, Proposal for Peer Review Services, Beals and Thomas, 61 Waverly Street, dated
- 387 12/1/2025
- 388 • Document entitled, Proposal for Peer Review Services, GCG, 61 Waverly Street, dated 11/24/2025
- 389 • Document entitled, Peer Review Draft Scope, SW Management and Drainage Infrastructure, N.D.
- 390